REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of June 8, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,225,981 to Yokogawa (hereinafter Yokogawa). Claims 5, 6, 12, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokogawa. Furthermore, the drawings were objected to.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for failing to include proper labelling/designation for FIGs. 11 and 12. In accordance with the suggestion in the Office Action, these figures have been amended to include the label "(PRIOR ART)". A complete set of drawings has been submitted and sheets 10 and 11 have been labelled "Replacement Sheets". No other changes have been made to the figures, and no new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections Under §101

In the Office Action, Claims 13-16 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, a computer program. In response to this rejection, Applicants have only amended Claims 13-16 to recite a computer-readable storage medium, as suggested in the Office Action. As the rejected claims now recite statutory subject matter, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Amendments to the Claims

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections based on the cited reference in the Office Action, Applicants nonetheless have amended certain claims in order to expedite prosecution of the present application by further emphasizing certain aspects of the claims. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that the claim amendments presented should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter. Applicants are not conceding by these amendments that any previously submitted claims are not patentable over the references of record. Applicants' present claim amendments are submitted only for purposes of facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue any previously submitted claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In this response, Applicants have amended some of the independent claims to further emphasize certain aspects of the claims. In particular, the claims have been amended to recite the limitation that tokens are only registered according conditions imposed on the morphological analysis and the value for an attribute flag for a header word associated with the token. In some cases, the condition can be imposed to register only the complex token, not all possible tokens, based on the attribute flag indicating whether or not the token is decomposable. Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled. No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Aspects of the Claims

Prior to discussing the cited reference, it may be useful to discuss certain aspects of the claims. The claims, as typified by Claims 1 and 3, recite systems and methods for performing morphological analysis of natural text to be processed. A system can include a dictionary unit for storing header words and attribute information, such as an attribute

flag for a header word indicating whether a token is decomposable into two or more subtokens. The system can also include a token list generator for referencing the dictionary unit and extracting tokens from natural text string and only registering extracted tokens having attribute information matching analysis conditions imposed on the system. The system can further include a token string selecting unit for selecting token strings for composing natural text, where the tokens used are selected from the generated token list. Although in some embodiments, token registration can be on the basis of any type of given condition, in at least one embodiment, as recited in Claim 3, the condition can be based on whether the token is decomposable into two or more subtoken tokens. If the condition specifies registering only complex tokens, the subtokens are not registered. Therefore, the conditions can be used to limit the number of tokens included in the token list.

The Claims Define Over the Cited Reference

As previously stated, Claims 1-16 were rejected as anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited reference, Yokogawa. Yokogawa discloses a language analyzer capable of morphological analysis that can judging the extent of coupling between two successive words and determine whether they form a phrase or not. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection and respectfully submits that Yokogawa fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious the limitations recited in Claims 1-16.

First, Yokogawa specifically fails to disclose or suggest that the tokens selected to be registered can be selected on the basis of attribute information. On page 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted in response to now-cancelled Claims 2 and 11 that:

> As per claims 2 and 11, ***Yokogawa*** discloses the morphological analyzer according to claims 1,10, wherein said token list generating unit registers, on said token list, only the tokens having attributes matching said conditions imposed on the morphological analysis on the basis of the attribute information of said header words corresponding to said tokens (column 13 lines 34-37, *dictionary information for individual words that compose a compound word are discarded if the words are judged to have a high coupling, based on the highest preference flag*).

However, the preference flag is only used by Yokogawa to identify words in the token list for which to discard dictionary information, ***but not to discard the words themselves*** or otherwise limit the number of entries in the token list. Thus Yokogawa discloses that all extracted tokens are always included in the token list, as shown by FIG. 9 (exemplary dictionary buffer; i.e., the token list), increasing the amount of needed storage capacity.

Furthermore, Yokogawa ***requires additional storage capacity*** not only because ***all*** subtokens are ***always*** stored, but because ***additional information*** is also always stored. That is, Yokogawa, aside from storing all tokens, also requires that the preference flag be stored in the token list as well. (See, e.g., FIG. 9 and accompanying text.) Therefore, Yokogawa first builds the token list and afterwards analyzes the token list to determine which dictionary information in the token list can be discarded based on the preference flag.

In contrast, amended Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, and 15 explicitly recite the limitation that only the tokens meeting conditions are stored; the attribute flag and discarded tokens are not stored. That is, a token is only registered or included in the token list if the token meets the conditions imposed on the morphological analysis. For example, a condition can be whether a token is decomposable into two or more other tokens. Such a configuration is advantageous, as the user can not only limit the type of tokens to be used by imposing one or more conditions on the system, but can also reduce overall data storage needs by reducing the amount of other data needed. That is, the preprocessing of

the data limits the token to only those matching the required attribute data, eliminating the need to store the attribute data and further reducing data storage requirements.

In addition, in regards to claims 3, the Office Action notes on Pages 6 and 7 that using attribute information indicating whether or not a token is decomposable to prevent subtokens from being registered would have been obvious to reduce processing and data storage. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Yokogawa suggests such a result. For the reasons stated above, it is clear that Yokogawa actually imposes additional storage requirements by storing not only the subtokens in a token list, regardless of whether they are decomposable. Additionally, as noted above the "preference" flag must also be stored not only for the tokens, but for the subtokens. Therefore, the token list of Yokogawa would not only include the information in the token list of the instant claims, but in addition would include the attribute flag information and the list of subtoken, thus increasing the amount of storage needed for the token list, in contrast to the amended claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 14, and 16 likewise define over Yokogawa.

Accordingly, Yokogawa, alone or in combination with any other reference of record, fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious independent Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15, as amended. Applicants therefore submit that the independent claims define over the references of record. Furthermore, as the remaining claims each depend from one of the independent claims while reciting additional features, the dependent claims likewise define over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: September 10, 2007

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Eduardo Quinones, Registration No. 58,575
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000